SECTION 1. PERMITTING MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES TO BE OFFERED IN ALL STATES FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD.

Section 4358(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended by section 172(a) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by this section shall only apply—

''(A) in 15 States (as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services) and such other States as elect such amendments to apply to them, and

''(B) subject to paragraph (2), during the 6½-year period beginning with 1992.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' has the meaning given such term by section 210(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410(h)).

''(2)(A) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study that compares the health care costs, quality of care, and access to services under medicare select policies with that under other medicare supplemental policies. The study shall be based on surveys of appropriate age-adjusted sample populations. The study shall be completed by June 30, 1997.

''(B) Not later than December 31, 1997, the Secretary shall determine, based on the results of the study under subparagraph (A), if any of the following findings are true:

''(i) The amendments made by this section have not resulted in savings of premium costs to those enrolled in medicare select policies (in comparison to their enrollment in medicare supplemental policies that are not medicare select policies and that provide comparable coverage).

''(ii) There have been significant additional expenditures under the medicare program as a result of such amendments.

''(iii) Access to and quality of care has been significantly diminished as a result of such amendments.

''(C) The amendments made by this section shall remain in effect beyond the 6½-year period described in paragraph (1)(B) unless the Secretary determines that any of the findings described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B) are true.

''(3) The Comptroller General shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which individuals who are continuously covered under a medicare supplemental policy are subject to medical underwriting if they change the policy under which they are covered, and to identify options, if necessary, for modifying the medicare supplemental insurance market to make sure that continuously insured beneficiaries are able to switch plans without medical underwriting. By not later than June 30, 1996, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress as report on the study. The report shall include a description of the potential impact on the cost and availability of medicare supplemental policies of each option identified in the study.''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,
WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clerical changes.

EXTEND MEDICARE SELECT TO ALL STATES FOR THREE YEARS

PRESENT LAW

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–508) established a demonstration project called Medicare Select under which insurers can market Medicare supplemental policies (called ''Medigap'' policies) that are the same as other Medigap policies except that supplemental benefits are paid only if services are provided through designated providers. The demonstration was limited to 15 states and expired December 31, 1994. The demonstration was extended to June 30, 1995, in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103–432).

HOUSE BILL

Medicare Select authority is extended to all states which wish to participate until June 30, 2000. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is to conduct a study of Medicare Select prior to 1998 to study cost, quality and access for Medicare Select compared to other Medigap policies. Medicare Select remains in effect unless the Secretary finds that Medicare Select has: (1) not resulted in savings of premium costs to beneficiaries compared to non-select Medigap policies; (2) resulted in significant additional expenditures for the Medicare program; or (3) resulted in diminished access and quality of care.

SENATE AMENDMENT

Same as the House bill except the extension is until December 31, 1996. The Secretary is to complete the study by June 30, 1996. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is to conduct a study on Medigap insurance and report to Congress by June 10, 1996. The report is to include: (1) an analysis of whether there are problems in the current Medigap system for beneficiaries who wish to switch Medigap policies without medical underwriting or pre-existing condition exclusions; (2) options for modifying the Medigap market to address any problems identified; and (3) an analysis of the impact of each option on the cost and availability of Medigap insurance, with particular reference to problems with Medicare Select policies.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment with the following changes: (1) Medicare Select is extended to all States for three years (until June 30, 1998); and (2) the GAO study is clarified to require analysis of all types of Medigap insurance by removing specific reference to Medicare Select. Reference to pre-existing condition exclusions is also removed as they are already prohibited under current law for Medigap replacement policies.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,
WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

☐ 1815

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 26, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 27, 1995, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLINGER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SIGNS OF A RECESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the front page of the New York Times reported that some members of the Federal Reserve Board ''have publicly expressed concern that the economy is now in considerably worse shape than they had expected.''

Two days ago, Washington Post columnist James K. Glassman wrote: ''Don't look now, but the recession may already have started.''

Mr. Glassman wrote that the White House is going to try to convince voters that this is a Gingrich recession, but then he says this:

> Such a charge, of course, is nonsense, and it's hypocritical coming from a President whose budget plan isn't so different from that of his adversaries.

Are we in a recession now? Well, the economy lost 101,000 jobs in May. Single family housing starts are at a 2-year low. Unsold inventories have, in the words of the New York Times, risen sharply.

According to Bridgewater Associates, a respected Connecticut firm that measures the economy, retail sales are wretched and second quarter GDP growth is about minus 0.5 percent.

I have spoken at least twice on this Floor about our tremendous problem of underemployment.

If you talk to any of these college graduates who can only find work in fast food outlets or restaurants, if they can find jobs at all, then you would know what I mean. I am sure they would say we are in a recession.

Like all recessions, though, the average consumer will not notice the full effects of this one until several months after it starts.

Thus most people will not notice this one, according to most economists, until very late this year, but really more probably a few months into 1996.

What is the cause of this new recession, or if not a recession, at least this severe slowdown?

Well, I think most people would agree that our obscene national debt of almost $5 trillion and our continuing deficits, or losses, of almost $1 billion a day, are the main problems.

Congressman ARMEY, a PhD economist, says the fault lies with the huge tax increase passed by President Clinton and the Democratic Congress in 1993.

Lending credence to this view is John Mueller, chief economist for Lehrman Bell Mueller Cannon, Inc. The columnist Glassman says Mueller believes there is a lag time of 2 years between actions of the Federal Reserve Board and their effects.

There is also a similar lag time with most major legislation passed by the Congress, too.

Anyone who blames a recession or economic slowdown in the next year or so on Republicans in Congress is either forgetting or ignoring the obvious.

First, most of the real changes passed by the House have not been passed by the Senate or have not been signed by the President. Most of the actions by the House have not even yet taken effect or actually gone into law.

Second, despite all the publicity about so-called spending cuts, none of these will go into effect until the next fiscal year begins in October.

Even then, the cuts do not exceed the growth in some programs, and thus overall Federal spending continues to go up and will do so every year under the most conservative budget that has been proposed.

Obviously our economy is on thin ice. So, what should we do?

First, we need to drastically reduce the Federal regulatory burden. The most conservative estimates are that Federal regulations now cost our economy approximately $500 billion each year.

Second, we need to bring Federal spending under control, cut our losses completely, and even start paying off our national debt is the only way to really help the economy, and that is with uninflated dollars.

It is ridiculous that we cannot even balance our budget until seven years from now, at the least. If we balanced the budget right now, we would still be spending over $1½ trillion by just our Federal Government this year. We would not have a lean government, we would still have a fat, sassy government. A strong, active, vibrant government is what we should have for that kind of spending.

Third, we need to overhaul, and greatly simplify and reform our federal tax code. We should greatly downsize and decrease the power and cost of the IRS.

It is just crazy that our Federal tax laws are so complicated and convoluted. I am told that we waste at least $200 billion a year in time lost and expense incurred in IRS compliance costs, keeping records, filling out forms, and so forth.

Finally, we need to lower taxes at all levels. The average person—not the wealthy, but the average—pays about half of his or her income in taxes of all types, Federal, State, and local, sales, property, income, excise, Social Security, and so forth.

The least efficient, least economical way to spend money is to have Government do it, because there is no real incentive or pressure on Government employees to work hard and/or save money, as there is in the private sector.

Money left in the private sector creates 2 to 2½ times as many jobs as does money turned over to Government.

Times are good now for some people. But they could and should be good for everyone.

Our country could be booming beyond belief—people could be doing two or three times as good as they are—if we would do the four things I just mentioned: first, deregulate our economy; second, balance our budget and start paying off the national debt; third, greatly simplify our tax code and basically eliminate the IRS; and fourth, lower the tax burden on our people, at all levels, so they can spend their own money wisely instead of having bureaucrats do it wastefully.

We could be booming, Mr. Speaker, but because real change has not yet taken place, there are many signs that we are headed into a recession that has been produced by our own Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KENNELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we will soon consider a farm bill that warrants an examination of the history of agriculture and a study of the lessons learned. There is linkage